

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action of February 18, 2009. This Amendment is in full response thereto. Thus, Applicants respectfully request continued examination and allowance of the application.

Claims 6-10 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beale (USPN 4,648,397). Applicant respectfully traverses because Beale fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claims as amended.

Claim 6 has been amended to include a first pressure sensor adapted to measure a pressure in a cabin of the aircraft and a second pressure sensor downstream of the servocontrolled pressure regulator adapted to measure a pressure in the line, wherein the servocontrolled pressure regulator can be actuated in response to a pressure control signal supplied by an electronic control unit based upon signals indicative of pressures sensed by said first and second pressure sensors.

In contrast, Beale discloses a complex control scheme that is based upon a mask suction pressure P1, an altitude H, a pressure of an air supply P01, and a pressure of an oxygen supply P02. To the extent that Beale addresses the claimed control scheme, it discloses control of an oxygen control flow means partly based upon mask suction pressure P1. Thus, it does not disclose a pressure sensor in the line between the oxygen supply and the mask. It also does not disclose another pressure sensor adapted to measure the cabin pressure. It also does not disclose an electronic control unit adapted to control the oxygen control flow means with a pressure control signal based upon the signals indicative of the cabin pressure and pressure in the line.

With particular respect to claim 7, Beale fails to disclose a cabin pressure sensor delivering an absolute pressure signal to an electronic control unit.

Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

First Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beale (USPN 4,648,397) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Babin (USPN 6,588,442). Applicant respectfully traverses because Beale fails to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations of the claims as described above and because the Examiner has not shown how Babin cures those deficiencies of Beale. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Second Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beale (USPN 4,648,397) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Danon (USPN 5,701,889). Applicant respectfully traverses because Beale fails to disclose, teach or suggest each of the limitations of the claims as described above and because the Examiner has not shown how Danon cures those deficiencies of Beale. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he/she is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

A Petition for a One Month Extension of Time has been contemporaneously submitted with this Amendment along with the associated fee. Otherwise, it is believed that no other fee is due at this time. If that belief is incorrect, please debit

deposit account number 01-1375. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 18, 2009**

/Christopher J. Cronin/
Christopher J. Cronin
Registration No. 46,513

Air Liquide
2700 Post Oak Blvd., 18th Floor
Houston, Texas 77056
Phone: 302-286-5525
Fax: 713-624-8950